

WESTERN INTERIOR SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
PUBLIC MEETING

October 24, 1996
Old Community Hall
Galena, Alaska

VOLUME II

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:
Raymond, Collins, Chairman
Angela Demientieff
Jack Reakoff
William Derendoff
Henry Deacon

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call the meeting back to order. And the next item on the agenda was to be a presentation and I understand there's a delay on that, somebody's on an audio conference. So we'll move on to the next item which would be the call for proposals and the generation of proposals.

And under that we have, one that we had asked about before that we need to see whether we're going to follow-up on, that's that one on our position on military installations. Is that still a problem, do we need a proposal on that? It was basically to request that even though they're living in rural areas that they're assigned with the military, that they not be granted the rural status, something to that effect. I think that was generated initially when Galena was in full operation here. But what's the situation now? I don't know if there are military personnel in the area or not. Any comments on that?

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, that primarily came up when there was a lot of problem with Ft. Greely hunters hunting on the Dalton Highway under this subsistence hunt. That was where that primary concern arose. Since then, that highlighted the problem with military personnel being in rural areas that are basically - they're subsistence or their whole provision was provided by the government. There may be, in the future or currently problems, but I'm unaware of what the current military demographics of like Galena here. So I'm not sure about if anybody from the Galena area would have input on if they're having problems with military personnel competing for subsistence, then they could bring that forward. I'm unaware of anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did they resolve the situation on the Dalton?

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, that was all resolved with a special change by the Board to make a special C&T for who was eligible to hunt within the corridor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. S. HUNTINGTON: Do you ask a question of - having problems with the military in Galena?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Is there a problem in them using the subsistence regulations to go hunt when they're resident here?

MR. S. HUNTINGTON: The probably isn't very many military here anymore. There isn't any more military here to speak of. Some of the old ones that used to be here come back every once in a while, it's kind of a pain in the butt. But in the early days, while we had them back here, we promulgated a regulation when I was on the Board, the alleviate some of the problem that they were causing by taking subsistence resource at that given time of the year. That was taking a moose during the winter, what we did was prohibit moose taking within five miles of the Galena area or something there about, I forget exactly what it was. So they had to go out and do their thing just like anybody else did, take them out of Galena.

But, yeah, well, they get a bunch of kids up there in the military, you know, with their heads cut off and no brains in it, why they could harm resources something terrible because they're just like anybody else, they move then, you know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. S. HUNTINGTON: But like right now, I would say it's pretty good. It's actually under control.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, I guess there's no need for us to go forward with any proposal then if it's no longer an issue. Other proposals? Let's see, things that we've discussed before, anything that comes to mind?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes. The one we should address right off the bat would be the Board deferred Proposal #41 based on your direction to defer it, which deals with the customary and traditional use determination for 18. That proposal wanted to grant three Kuskokwim communities to have customary and traditional use of moose in Unit 18. You have that under - I think I stuck it under Tab 3 and I gave you the full analysis that was before you last year. But subsequent to your action, you met in Aniak and et cetera, so at the end of the analysis for #41 is a map and a geographic description of the area that Mike* came up with based on community studies for the three communities of Aniak, Chuathbaluk and Napamute. So I think what I would recommend is that if you agree with that interpretation, would be to draft a proposal and submit it and then we'll find out in the office should it be a proposal or should it be an attachment to the deferred proposal. But right now I'm not real sure on that, but the Board wanted us to work out something and I think the two Councils have worked out something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And if I remember right, from the meeting, the chair of the western had no problem with that proposal, I guess, granting that. Our initial concern was getting it mixed up with their request to be granted rights in 19, but I think the two issues are separate. It's not the people from the 21(E) that are asking for it, it's somebody from the Kuskokwim that are closely tied in with those other villages, they didn't have any problem with it, I think. So do you want to go forward with that, perhaps with the map?

MR. MATHEWS: It may help those that are not familiar with the area to look at the map to get an understanding of what we're talking about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: The three communities in question are right near the boundary of Unit 18.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And they've shaded in the area on the map where they hunt in 18. And I think it would be better if we modified that because it does set a precedent of just asking for C&T findings in part of an area instead of the whole area.

MR. REAKOFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The area they were actually using. Do I have a motion then for the submission of that proposal again with the map attached? Unfortunately the two members from that area, it's what we're talking about before, they're the ones that are not here, they would move it, I'm sure.

MR. REAKOFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. CHAIRMAN: A representative from the Kuskokwim.

MR. REAKOFF: We could move it up now and then we'll be able to discuss it next meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. This will just get it on the books.

MR. REAKOFF: I make a motion to move it forward with the map.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a second to that?

MR. DEACON: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Henry. Any discussion? All those in favor signify by raising your right hand. Okay, it's yes votes for all five members present. Motion carried.

MR. MATHEWS: Now, who seconded the motion, I didn't catch that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Henry.

MR. MATHEWS: Henry, okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Henry seconded it. So that will go forward with the only modification is the attachment of a map now.

MR. MATHEWS: The next one - well, both of them got their own uniqueness to it. Why don't we just do the fun one first, there's a letter that I'll pass out from the Native village of Tanana which is now a proposal. And I'll wait until you get copies of that to explain that.

This is a letter from the Native village of Tanana. Their subsistence fish and wildlife advisory committee. And basically they're asking for controlled use area which prohibits the use of airboats for moose hunting or to transport moose or moose hunting equipment within the Tanana Tribal Council service area, specifically in Units 20(F) and 20(C) and 21(B). And I won't go through the full description of the areas, it's written out there below you. The reason they're requesting this is to protect and conserve waterfowl habitat from being overrun and destroyed. And let's see, they have noticed a decline in the waterfowl in and around Tanana. Another reason it lies in the way that the tribal members

teach their youths to subsist off the land, et cetera. So they want to preserve and protect this resource for transmission of their knowledge and understandings.

Anyway, so that's been - it will be a proposal. When this was brought up to the Eastern Interior Regional Council, they drafted a companion or a parallel proposal to this, so there's two proposals before the Federal Subsistence Board dealing with establishing this controlled use area prohibiting the use of airboats. Like I did with Eastern Interior I need to advise you that the area in description does contain some Federal lands, but most of the area is under State jurisdiction and there is a question of navigable waters and access, but again, that will be analyzed as the proposal goes forward. And the reason it's before you now is 21(B) is within your jurisdiction and to let you know of this concern.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But there's no action required of us at this time because if it's a proposal it will be in the booklet that we'll deal with later?

MR. MATHEWS: Right. You have the options of just waiting until the analysis comes out, of giving support to the proposal or doing a companion proposal. I don't think a companion proposal would be needed, because your sister Council to the east has already submitted one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. MATHEWS: It's going to be a very interesting proposal.

MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, let me make some additional comments relative to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. GUENTHER: Monday, before I left I was asked to do a preliminary review of that proposal. The management team with the subsistence division reviews all the proposals when they come in to see if they're appropriate for the Federal Board to act on relative to subsistence. And there's an extensive discussion about whether this proposal is most appropriately acted on through subsistence or if it even actually falls within the privy of subsistence or if it's better - if it is a legitimate problem that it be acted upon through some other mechanisms dealing with the land management agencies and that's what I've been asked to look into and review that situation. And I was also asked to look at how extensive this problem is and what the specific problem is relative to this. I've got very little information at this point because I really haven't, other than just an opportunity to talk to a couple of people about it, I haven't done an analysis. So it's possible this may not come back as a proposal to you.

One of the options that's being looked at right now, if it doesn't - if it's not forwarded as a proposal, is that it would be dealt with by individual land management agencies as a habitat protection item. See this is where it comes in, is this habitat protection that's relative to subsistence or is it outside the privy of the existing subsistence regs. And I don't have an answer right now. The information that I've gotten so far indicates that there actually may be some habitat damage in some situations relative to this.

And again, I haven't totally analyzed this, so take this information with a grain of salt. It appears that in some slough situations where airboats have run a channel, where they're running on very little or practically no water over

these slough areas, that the impact to the vegetation causes open mud areas and then that high water tends to cause an erosion in those areas and open up a new channel and drain off any water that's residual in the slough, sort of making a marsh situation. They feel this is detrimental to some of the - to the habitat that's evolved in that marsh type habitat. I don't know how extensive this is or if it is a significant problem, but that's one of the things that has been mentioned to me. That's where the waterfowl may be involved in this. So that's an update at this point. And, you know, probably by the end of next week I'll have looked at this to the extent that I'm going to look at it and make a recommendation to our upper management group. If you're interested in what my findings were, give me a call Thursday of next week or Friday, and I'll let you know or I can get back to individual Council members through Vince or if you want to call me personally, I can let you know what's happening on that. That's everything I have.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I think on that, I think it might be a good idea if you could just feed it to me and I'll mail it out. This one is taking off literally. So it may be wise for you guys to be informed of this, because of the usage in that area. So whatever he gets I'll just mail it out to you so you're informed of it because I think you'll be asked by people in the Tanana and possibly Ruby area on this.

MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, one other comment relative to this. It appears that most of the area that's being requested in the Tanana other than just actually into your region is not Federal lands. There's some scattered parcels of BLM land and where the jurisdiction problem comes in that the BLM lands, waters within the BLM lands, since they're not considered conservation units do not fall under this recent court ruling. And so even though that's kind of in a limbo state right now, those waters, even in the future, if navigable waters are taken over, still would not be under the privy of Federal subsistence regs. So there's - that's a little bit of a complication here too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Thank you. Questions about that? So I think we'll just wait for further information and we'll deal with it when it comes out as a proposal in the winter.

MR. MATHEWS: The only two remaining ones and I've talked to different people on this one and I'm not sure and maybe others will chime in on this, but - and it may not be necessary for proposals, but the Alaska State Board of Game adopted new regulations dealing with ceremonial hunts. And it's on this.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yellow handout?

MR. MATHEWS:yeah, yellow handout. Their regulation would apply throughout the State. Under Federal regulations, the only ceremonial hunt regulations for funeral and mortuary ceremonies is on the backside and they cover Units 1 through 5. And in some ways they're more restrictive. So I don't know if this Council wants to just leave it in the State arena which applies everywhere or if they want to put together a proposal that would adopt the State regs and the Federal regulations. The question that may come up - well, I don't know, that's - it would help the agencies - the Federal agencies investigate this to see how it would apply. It's not a concern on Bureau of Land Management lands or Fish & Wildlife Service lands. I'm not sure how it would apply on Park Service lands. And I didn't have a chance to talk with the actual State representatives to see if they wanted to talk about this new regulation that went into effect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of the major changes, I think, is - let's see if I understand this, is in the State regs now there's no longer need for prior permission. They can take what is needed, but there is reporting requirements within 20 days. That's one of the changes. Whereas the Federal one says, anybody who wants to do that has to contact the appropriate Federal manager and agency prior to attempting to.

MR. MATHEWS: Right. And the Federal only covers Units 1 through 5.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. So it doesn't apply to these?

MR. MATHEWS: It looks like Tim Osborne would like to speak on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tim.

MR. OSBORNE: I can answer any questions you have on this if you want.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Can you speak to what the changes are just for clarification? From what State law is now, how - what it is?

MR. OSBORNE: The prior it used to be that it was just funeral potlatches, now it's memorial potlatches are also included. And the prior used to be, prior notification and now it's after it's taken. And under the State law, of course, you can take anywhere moose or big game for religious purposes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. OSBORNE: So it would cover parks, refuges, State land, private lands, everything. So it's fairly encompassing the way it is now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: From the State's perspective, is there a need to have parallel regs on the Federal or would it make any difference because you have jurisdiction right now, I guess?

MR. OSBORNE: Correct. It wouldn't make any difference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. OSBORNE: And also it would simplify for people who are out there hunting, they wouldn't have to worry about what land they were on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. OSBORNE: Because it would be covered on no matter which land they were on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Questions?

MR. REAKOFF: My question is, why were these Federal regulations promulgated for Units 1 through 5, were they promulgated before the current State regulations?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes. That's what happened. And when the Board adopted the ones for Southeast, that was prior to the Board of Game's action. So they used the existing regulation, that's why they look the way they do. Southeast did not take any action in this round on this. And I didn't ask specifically if they felt like Tim just laid out here, that the State regulations meeting their needs. I didn't get a chance.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. REAKOFF: I don't feel that any action is necessary on this. It's already provided for by State, it has a more liberal reporting period so it's better for the subsistence users.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And this has been adopted already?

MR. OSBORNE: Correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Was it adopted this spring?

MR. OSBORNE: That was adopted in the March meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, okay. Well, hearing no further discussion I guess there is no need to take action at this point.

MR. REAKOFF: I make a motion to table that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, I don't think we need to.....

MR. REAKOFF: Don't do anything?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was no motion to bring it on the table, we're just under discussion.

MR. REAKOFF: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: The final ones would be, and again, they're not - there may not be action needed to be taken, under Tab 3, when you get beyond the information on 21(E) and the moose handout, you'll get to proposals that say deferred on it. Those were deferred, C&T proposals that were deferred last year due to staff resources and time to do analysis. One of them is dealing with caribou in Unit 24.

And that one will go forward and the other one, other two, I should say are Unit 23 caribou, western arctic herd, which you have a - I'd have to look up the C&T determination, but you have an involvement in that one. And then Unit 26(A), well, 26 sheep. They're just before you to remind you that they were deferred last year, they'll be back before you with full analysis. It's just an opportunity for you to look at them. One of them happens to be from Jack Reakoff so he may want to speak about it or wait until the proposal comes out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're still trying to find them in there.

MR. MATHEWS: It's under Tab 3. If you just go beyond the moose. Hopefully they're in there, I can blame it on the copy machine that it's not doing its job right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I found it.

MR. MATHEWS: It's not that you have to do anything right now, I just wanted you to be aware of these. And that there are issues that are going to be coming before you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. MATHEWS: And that's it. You'll get full analysis at your next meeting so the Council can pass a recommendation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So this will be coming back up again?

MR. REAKOFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Has anything changed on that Jack, it's still as written?

MR. REAKOFF: Yes, as written and it will just come back up on the next round.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. And we've already taken action to approve this, so our position would be the same then, you're saying? It should be the same.

MR. REAKOFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. MATHEWS: No, you've never - these proposals never got before you.

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, it never did come up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: You did discuss it a little bit, but you didn't write a proposal on it, Jack did it on his own.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. And that's been submitted and will be in the Federal then?

MR. REAKOFF: I submitted this last year. And because of staff constraints they didn't.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, we could move to adopt it then so that it would be a - it wouldn't be just an individual, it would come from us if you so wish. That would be an option that we'd have at this time.

MR. MATHEWS: You could, yes, adopt the same proposal and then I think it will just be combined together from both, Mr. Reakoff and from Western Interior. That is an option.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What do you feel?

MR. REAKOFF: I make a motion to adopt this proposal, what's the number, 55?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. It was scratched out, but I don't know what that means.

MR. MATHEWS: Don't go by that handwriting on there. Just call it the deferred proposal from caribou 24.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. There's a move to adopt, is there a second?

MR. DEACON: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Henry. Discussion of that? All those in favor signify by raising your right hand. Okay, it's yes votes for members present, motion carried. So it can go forward to get it on the table and get it discussed.

Okay. The next one here is Unit 23 western arctic caribou herd.

MR. MATHEWS: This one you have, because of the present C&T's, you have interest in it. It was proposed by Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission and the Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory Council. Basically you could wait until the analysis comes out which would further flush out what they are actually addressing here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. What's the shaded area?

MR. MATHEWS: The shaded? Conrad may need to help me on that one because I think we had a computer problem. You need to focus on the - the shading is changes, but the ones with lines out - lined out means it's being deleted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: Someone got happy with the computer making it confusing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: So the ones with lines through them would be deleted, that's what they're proposing. The ones that are highlighted without lines through them would be additions or changes to the existing regs. Does that help any? I know that goes against the way that it's done before the Game of Board proposals and before the Board of Fishery proposals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And the proposal includes people from our area, the residents of Unit 21(D) west, right? Is that our area?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes.

MR. GUENTHER: Yes.

MR. MATHEWS: Correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So we're included in this proposal for C&T.

MR. MERRIT: Vince, excuse me, could it be possible to have you read that proposal?

MR. MATHEWS: Sure. We have a request to read the proposal. The proposal is dealing with Unit 23 caribou. What they're asking about - well, I'll give the existing regs. It's pretty complex, but I'll give you the existing regs and then their changes. It is in the public book back there somewhere and we can get other books out. But anyways, it's Unit 23 caribou western arctic herd only. The current determination is rural residents of Unit 21(D) west of the Koyukuk and Yukon Rivers and rural residents of Units 22(A), 22(B), 23, 24 and 26(A). Existing regs go on further to say, Unit 23 caribou except western arctic herd, no determination. What the two entities are asking to change, this is to change regulation. For Unit 23, they would want the addition of south of the Arctic Circle, caribou, not western arctic, they're deleting western arctic herd only, rural residents of Unit 21(D) west of the Koyukuk and Yukon Rivers and rural residents of Unit 22(B), 23, 24 and 26(A). So they dropped, it appears to be in that part, 22(A) and just kept in 22(B). Okay, then it goes on, the remainder caribou dropped the western arctic herd, rural residents of Unit 21(D) west of the Koyukuk and Yukon Rivers and rural residents of Units 23,

24, and 26(A). And so it sounds to me that they're, hopefully somebody will correct me, they're going to be doing it by species and not by herds. And they're - I can't figure out how they're dealing in units there, if they're all covered.

So basically they're going from herd to species. And again, this will be back before the Council with full analysis, you know, and hopefully they'll do a better job of explaining it than I have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions about this proposal? So no position at this time then, I guess. But it will come back to us later in the winter - well, that's what we have to determine when we're meeting yet. I don't know if it's called the winter meeting or.....

MR. MATHEWS: It would be in February.

MR. CHAIRMAN:February meeting, okay.

MR. MATHEWS: We call it spring meetings and then we call it late winter, I don't know, just call it February.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it would be nice to have spring in February this year.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can arrange that?

MR. MATHEWS: I'll put in a request, spring in February.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next proposal that was also deferred deals with sheep, residents of Anaktuvuk Pass, Kaktovik, Nuiqsut and that's the way it is right now. And then in sheep - that's in 26(A) and (B) and then 26(C) sheep residents of Arctic Village, Chalkytsik, Fort Yukon, Kaktovik, Nuiqsut and Venetie. And they're proposing to change it to add residents of Point Hope in the western area and also residents of Point Hope in the 26(C) which would be the eastern area, I guess.

MR. MATHEWS: They also appear to be adding all the residents of Unit 26, where the existing one just has the residents of Kaktovik, Nuiqsut and that's it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: And Anaktuvuk.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And the reason it involves us is because of the residents of Wiseman and St. Mary are there. Do you have any feeling on that Jack, if that would impact?

MR. REAKOFF: As long as Wiseman is included in the Unit 26(B) part of it, that was my - that's a Region 10 proposal and that deals mostly with increased usage by Region 10 people. But I don't feel that there will be a lot of increase subsistence use with this addition of Point Hope. So I don't - just let it go into the process and then it will be dealt with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions on that anyone? The next well, Proposal 41 is one is we've dealt with already. So any other proposals to come before us?

Maybe we could open that up, does anybody have any to bring? Tim, did you have something?

MR. OSBORNE: For the record my name is Tim Osborne and I'm representing myself and Hazel Strassburg from Galena. I have a proposal that we'd like you to consider. If you turn to Page 118 in the purple book here, Unit 21 and look under the section of caribou there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What was the page on that?

MR. OSBORNE: 118.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 118.

MR. OSBORNE: I forgot my reading glasses today so I have to hold everything at arm's length here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I have that, caribou.

MR. OSBORNE: If you look under caribou under the very first paragraph it says, Unit 21 western arctic herd only, rural residents of Unit 21(D) west of the Koyukuk and Yukon Rivers and rural residents of Units 23 and 24. And what I'd like to propose is that that paragraph read Unit 21 western arctic herd only, rural residents of Unit 21(D) and rural residents of 23 and 24. And delete the words, west of the Koyukuk and Yukon Rivers. And the reason for that is that the residents of Galena have had a long history of hunting the western arctic caribou, but when the C&T determinations were made they were based, not on the historic usage, but rather on the State regulation which would limit caribou hunting seasons in the Galena area. The seasons were limited to minimize the harvest of the Galena mountain caribou herd which resides locally. And so that's the reason that the season's not open year-round immediately north of Galena. There's a small herd of 300 caribou that lives up in the Galena mountain and winter just to the north of the village here. So we have a very limited season on them that's only 30 days long. However, the Galena residents have had traditional use of western arctic caribou.

The western arctic caribou herd currently has 500,000 animals and there's no resource programs. This change would correct an oversight by the Federal Board to give Galena residents their historic C&T use of the herd. There's documented use since 1956 until present. The areas that people have harvested western arctic caribou have been the Kaltag/Unalakleet portage, GMU 21(D) and 22 and Nulato Hills and GMU 21, 23 and 22, Wrench Lake, Tag River and GMU 23, Purcell Mountains in GMU 24 and 23. Within 21(D) itself, both west and east of the Koyukuk Rivers, the Huslia area in Unit 24. And we also have had emergency openings of caribou seasons north of town here with - where western arctic caribou have come into this area to take advantage of those.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. OSBORNE: The resource has been harvested between August and April. And most Galena hunters who do get caribou share them with other Galena residents when they're successful. And I'd request - Hazel and I request that the Regional Council adopt a proposal under the name of the Western Regional Council. I have some paperwork if you'd like.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Comments, questions? Do we have a motion? Bill, do you have any comments on that?

MR. DERENDOFF: What date did you say, August and - what did you say?

MR. OSBORNE: Well, people from Galena have traditionally hunted between August and April western arctic caribou. They've usually used aircraft to fly over to Dall Creek or Purcell Mountain or Wrench Lake in August to get caribou.

MR. DERENDOFF: But you didn't do anything with the date on this?

MR. OSBORNE: No. The dates would stay - we're not requesting the change in the area north of Galena. All we're doing is requesting is a C&T determination.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So this proposal doesn't - Bill, it doesn't deal with seasons. The customary and traditional finding is a determination made by the Board of who has the right to hunt in that area when there is an open season.

MR. DERENDOFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. CHAIRMAN: And Galena residents were excluded. It was only people that lived west of the river and they're just asking to be included when there is an open season, that it would cover them, too.

MR. DERENDOFF: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that's what the C&T involves. Saying that, yes, they had a customary use of that when they were available.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to adopt Tim Osborne and Hazel Strassburg's proposal as written. Adopt it under the Western Interior Regional Council.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there a second to that?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Angela. And if you give that to Vince - any further discussion of that? Is there any comments on that from the audience that are affected here? Okay. All those in favor signify by raising your right hand.

MR. S. HUNTINGTON: The man over there was going to comment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, sorry. Okay, did you want to comment?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I missed the proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Meet with Tim.

MR. OSBORNE: Galena residents customary and traditional of caribou.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Yes votes for the five members present, motion carried.

MR. MATHEWS: I just need clarification from Tim, did you send this in on your own already?

MR. OSBORNE: (No audible response)

MR. MATHEWS: Okay, so I'll need a copy of this.

MR. OSBORNE: You can have that one.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So consider this our proposal now.

MR. OSBORNE: No, it's not - no, Hazel and I are not submitting that to the Federal Subsistence Board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. OSBORNE: We're submitting it to you to adopt and you adopted it now, there's no reason for us to submit it ourselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any other proposals suggested, either by members or anyone here for our consideration?

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: Can I do one?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, come up and identify yourself.

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: My name is Gilbert Huntington, I live here in Galena. I think it was last summer or sometime there was, I think it was this group or I don't know if it was the regent - the subsistence council itself that had a proposal, passed a proposal for subsistence hunting only on the Koyukuk refuge, I think it was and I was against it at that time and it was rescinded by the Council. And I think in talking with some of the people in Koyukuk as well as some of the people here in Galena, I think it would be advisable for this group here to maybe propose, first of all, to the Board of Game for a subsistence hunt on the Koyukuk River from the mouth up to the Gisasa River. Subsistence only for moose in the fall hunt. And then if that were to pass, I would support a subsistence hunt on Federal land up to the Gisasa River also. I think, for sure, the people in Koyukuk support that. I wrote a letter to them to that effect that they should first approach the State system for a subsistence only hunt in that area and I would support that. And I would hope that your group, as well, as the subsistence council or what do you call it, Federalli's anyway, would come up with a regulation for a subsistence only hunt in that area, too. Maybe Tim can elaborate more on that.

MR. OSBORNE: Yes, for some clarification, I think what Gilbert would like to propose would be that for the State registration hunt right now, there's two parts, subsistence registration hunt and a general registration hunt. The general registration hunt is open to the entire Koyukuk controlled use area and the subsistence registration hunt is open to the entire Koyukuk River area, Koyukuk controlled use area within 21(D). And I think Gilbert would like to see the subsistence section open for the entire controlled use area, but the general hunt only start at the mouth of Gisasa and then up river from that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And would this - but that's under State regs, isn't it?

MR. OSBORNE: Correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it really wouldn't be a proposal coming from us. It is something that we could make a comment on or something, but it would have to go through the State process, I think.

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: No, I want the Federal system to have a subsistence hunt only on the Federal land up to the Gisasa also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: Because it doesn't do any good to have only the Federal land closed to sports hunting or whatever you want to call it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: It needs to come before the State and the Federal to have any positive impact.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: You listen to people from Koyukuk and they say, you know, we're not getting ample opportunity, we're being overrun by sport hunters from elsewhere.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: And I'm sure to some extent it's true. And they requested it, you know, I don't know if you guys were listening in on to that meeting we had, it was teleconferenced here where it was.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where they reversed the.....

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was the closure - yeah. Yes, I was part of that, I was on that teleconference. I'm trying to think of.....

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: What's wrong with this group here proposing to the State Game Board to close that area to sport hunting, have a subsistence only hunt?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we're developing proposals only for the Federal Board to apply to Federal lands, so we wouldn't be proposing something to the State. That would go through a different system, do you see what I mean?

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're not writing proposals for the State, we're only writing proposals for the Federal Board on Federal land. And part of the problem with that other proposal that you're talking about is it would applied only to Federal lands so it didn't really apply to the river banks. So in order to make it effective, it needs to be the State that adopted it so that it applied to both of those lands, do you see what I mean?

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The closure, that was one of the reasons for asking to reverse it. The State was trying to remedy it with other - by other means. And so they asked the Federal to reverse that. Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: Also, Interior proposals are not up before the Board of Game until when?

MR. OSBORNE: Until next year. So in the cycle for December of '97.

MR. MATHEWS: So at that time you could submit a proposal both to the Federal Board and to the State Board for this action. Right now if this Council took action, you'd have part of it in and part of it out. And it would be better to wait when we're in cycle with the Board of Game and then submit, as you described, a proposal to the State and a proposal to the Federal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And we could take an action supporting that proposal, I guess, on the State or in reference to that.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that it's the job of the, what's this advisory committee in this area, the Middle Yukon - the Middle Yukon Advisory Committee to come up with a proposal and submit it to the Game Board, State Game Board and the Federal Regional Council. I'm on the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee and that's the way I would do that, is submit it both at the same time so that it comes into cycle.

We got stuck on that one last year. We passed that and then it was rescinded because of a lot of the willows and river bars on the State lands. So I think the State is behind - would be behind the proposal because they want to slow down the cow hunt in the subsistence part of that hunt on the Lower Koyukuk. So I think that that proposal would go through the Game Board pretty well. But a submittal by the Middle Yukon Advisory Committee is where that will have to come from because as far as I know this Council hasn't - or I'm not sure if it's within - what kind of a policy do we have on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we can propose something in relation to Federal land.

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess it would be proposing that that would be subsistence only on the Federal lands within that area. But if we did that it would close it to a lot of State residents because there's a different interpretation of who is subsistence between the State and the Federal, that's where the advisory would come in - or where there would be a difference.

MR. MATHEWS: If the question is, can you write a proposal and submit it to the Board of Game, Eastern Interior has done that already. So I mean you can do that as a body. But I think in this case, the way Jack laid it out would probably be better, we could go either - Gilbert submits two proposals or words to the advisory committee and then work through myself and Jim Marcott and sort it out and get it to the two boards, then it's timely to go that way. This Council at its meeting like this could adopt a parallel proposal beforehand - before it comes through the analysis process. It's a timing question right now is the main reason we're all kind of dancing around a little bit.

MR. REAKOFF: The main problem is the State Game Board won't meet on this area for another year or so. If we propose something right now, I mean we'd be out of synch, we'd be back to square one where we were last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hunters in the field would have to decide which was State and which was Federal land.

MR. REAKOFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. OSBORNE: You can petition for an agenda change to get it out of synch if you wanted to.

MR. MATHEWS: There is that option, but you have to have great compelling reasons to get an agenda change. It puts your whole request under a higher scrutiny.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. REAKOFF: It's my observation that there is a need for a regulation change. And I'm of the opinion that the harvest is over 200 bulls, there has to be - there's compelling need for the State Game Board to address that problem. So I feel that the Middle Yukon could petition for a cycle change for a regulation adjustment in the Lower Koyukuk, but that might make a lot of headaches for Tim. He's checking out.

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: I'm not looking for any headaches. But that's why I'm asking Tim here, is there justification? In your view, is there justification for an agenda change?

MR. OSBORNE: Well, it's actually a resource allocation problem which Fish & Game itself does not get into. So it would have to be the advisory committee petitioning for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And what's the deadline, Vince, for Federal, what's the deadline that we're working under for proposals?

MR. MATHEWS: The deadline has changed, what's published is October 25th, which is tomorrow, it's been extended to November 8th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: November 8th, okay. and when is the local advisory committee meeting?

MR. OSBORNE: It will meet November 9th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The day after. What I was going to suggest is that if they develop something at that that they might submit to the Federal too, so that they would parallel, but they would be a day late.

MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, if there was action taken through the State, it would basically effect both State and Federal lands and so it would accomplish what you're asking without a Federal action taking place at all. Because State jurisdiction is on both Federal and State lands, where jurisdiction here is only on Federal lands. If Federal action was taken and State action was not taken, then it creates this problem that's been mentioned earlier where who knows where along the river Federal lands end and State lands start because of ordinarily high water line situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And we could still take a position on that at our February meeting and submit a letter to the Board of support of whatever was proposed by the local advisory committee here. Does that get at what you.....

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: Well, what's wrong with this committee here, I guess you're a committee, bringing forth a proposal, the Federal and then that would have the impact of the - if, in fact, the Regional Advisory committee or whatever it is here and the State or someone would come up with a proposal for an agenda change or request to the State, that would kind of nudge them over the edge or at least you think it would help the Game Board that, in fact, lean toward a change?

MR. REAKOFF: We could be in support of a cycle change for the Game Board so that they would address this issue. You know, we could endorse that. But the problem is is, you know, we just got hung-up on this one this last year with the State and Federal lands, the Federal lands are way out away from the river and are getting.....

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: I understand that. But that might be all that's necessary. If, in fact, that at least I've heard one member say that - he recognized that there is a need if, in fact, you would come up with a statement or whatever it might be to the Game Board in support of a change of cycle. That might be sufficient.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The only difference, I guess, would be if we come forward with one through the Federal, through this, and applying only to Federal lands, that it would exclude some State residents. In fact, it would exclude residents of Tanana and some of the other communities in there because they don't have C&T determination on the Federal lands, I think. So you would be setting up a situation where some residents of the area would be able to hunt on that Federal land and some others would not, whereas, the State has a different definition of who is subsistence.

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: I don't think that would be much of a problem anyway. Most people that are traveling from other villages to the Koyukuk River are going to go up there on Three-Day Slough where most of the moose are anyway. Not many people are hanging around down the lower Koyukuk River hunting because the stocks aren't there really. The moose aren't there in sufficient numbers to, you know, and the pressure - the local hunting pressure, you know, kind of - especially from people from Koyukuk who hunt there, people from Nulato also, but I'm sure they qualify.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They don't, I think. Does Nulato qualify under the Federal? So it would be excluding the ones from Ruby, Tanana and up?

MR. OSBORNE: Ruby's also included in C&T in moose in Unit 20(D) of the Federal regulations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. REAKOFF: This Regional Council could write a letter, have a letter drafted, submit it to the State Game Board for consideration of a cycle change to address the State subsistence hunt on the lower Koyukuk River. That's what we could do. And I make a motion to have a letter drafted and submitted to the State Game Board for a cycle change for the proposal that shall be promulgated by the Middle Yukon advisory committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a motion, is there a second to that?

MR. OSBORNE: You may want to correct that motion and say that a proposal moved by Gilbert Huntington because.....

MR. REAKOFF: Well, that shall be submitted.....

MR. OSBORNE: The committee may not, but.....

MR. REAKOFF: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. OSBORNE:Gilbert can put one in as an individual.

MR. REAKOFF: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Is there a second?

MR. DEACON: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Henry. Discussion of that? All those in favor signify by raising your right hand. Okay, yes votes for all five members present, motion carried. I think that will do it. And, Gilbert, you still have the option of drafting what you're proposing here and submitting it to the Federal too and then we'll be acting on it in our winter season. I wish we had all of the members from this area here now from up the Koyukuk, but Harold isn't here and the others - they might want to move forward with it more, but I'm a little reluctant without having them in on the discussion for us to take action. Would that address what you want?

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: I think what you've just done will have.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And as I said, you have the option of writing one and sending it to them and then it will be published and then we can discuss it again in the winter.

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: Okay. And when does this meeting end?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Noonish, today.

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tim, I did have one question in relation to this, do you think there's any chance of getting some kind of a joint group meeting on this and talk about it? We're concerned about the future of moose up there, too. If there could be a joint approach to that, I think it would sure be useful.

MR. OSBORNE: Between what, the Western Interior Regional Council and the Game Board - the Yukon.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just the local advisory committees or whoever, so that we could work in concert on solving this problem. And I think Ed was saying that it needs something like that down in the Holy Cross area for approaching that one,

too, because you do have this problem of State and Federal lands. And I think everybody wants to see the resource conserved. So I don't know how we could best do that.

MR. OSBORNE: Well, one of the things you're getting into now is this whole issue of how does the State advisory committee system interact with the Federal Regional Councils, you know. Which I know you've grappled with in the past and it still needs - I personally think it needs to be visited, you know, whether you take input from them or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think we can take input from anyone. But whether there's a direct relationship, you know, or whether we can work directly on issues, I don't.....

MR. MATHEWS: There would be no problem doing that. I think the funding is the question at hand. And I think there's still negotiations going on in that. But one option would be simpler than addressing the whole funding question would be to have a subcommittee of this group meet and attend the local advisory committee meeting, I mean that would be one option right away. The limitations of that is that they're just a subcommittee, they're not taking full action.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. MATHEWS: They can't say, well, this is what the Regional Council is going to do. That would be one option right off the bat. The other would be - but the schedules don't match, that's the real problem, would be to have a joint - we did it kind of in Huslia, they had their local advisory committee. They recessed and then we came into town. Maybe to have more overlap, but without talking to Tim, the schedules in my head, they don't match. I don't think it matches well. We'd have to see on that. But the subcommittee would be an option. The Federal Subsistence Board made it clear that they want cooperative efforts to go on in this Koyukuk area because they know it's not going to be resolved with a single proposal. So I would take that as meaning money would follow that directive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that would be better instead of us just having our debate here trying to resolve the problem and then the advisory committee trying to solve it through the State when both are involved in it.

MR. OSBORNE: Well, the meeting is going to be the 9th of November in Kaltag for the Middle Yukon advisory committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And when those meetings take place, the Federal managers are involved in that, too, from the refugees and so on?

MR. OSBORNE: Usually they attend, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Okay, we'll keep that in mind when we're further down the agenda. Maybe we would want to designate some of our members from here to take part in that. Thank you. Any other proposals to come before us? Well, hearing none, then we'll move on in our agenda. Tom's still out?

MR. EARLY: I can do it, if you're ready.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's see, if we have other business we could deal with something else here and give him another opportunity.

MR. MATHEWS: the only other business we have and I'm not sure we've already discussed it, Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission appointments. I'm not sure we have to do it now or at the next meeting, but your appointee right now presently is Pollock Simon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. MATHEWS: I think Steve mentioned it wasn't sure that he wanted to continue or not. So it may be better to wait on that until the next meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: That's remaining and then.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are no seats on Lake Clark coming up.....

MR. MATHEWS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN:so there would be nothing on that. We couldn't recommend anybody for.....

MR. MATHEWS: And then I've been noting as you've been moving through your meeting any of the issues that you've kind of indicated were issues that Ray should bring up when he meets with the 10 chairs and then meets with the Federal Subsistence Board. So we're through that other new business.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We were to have a public comment period and we've been taking them here. But is there anyone from the general public that wanted to address on any issues? We could open up an opportunity for that here.

MR. O. HUNTINGTON: My name is Orville Huntington and I'm not quite a resident of Galena yet. November 11th I think I'll be here a year and then I'll be a resident. But I would like to thank the Alaska Department of Fish & Game for working with the local people on their subsistence moose hunt last fall. I actually got to go out and spend time with my boys and it was good to teach them a lot about other local people, rather than a bunch of sport hunters coming in and filling up the river. So I thought it was good that they did that and I hope it happens more in the future. I can't really say enough how good it is to see you people here coming to Galena. I don't know where you guys are meeting next, but I hope I get to work with you guys again sometime. I spent some good time with Henry. I'm always learning and I'd like to go up to Huslia again, but actually I got to go to Alatna. So I'd just like to thank you guys for coming and spending your time here and sharing with us. That's all I got to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Anyone else? I guess we should move to the presentation - well, is there anything else we could deal with before?

MR. MATHEWS: Well, the other thing would be is to decide when and where you'd like to meet for the next meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: And you have a calendar under Tab 1, it's a green colored sheet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It should be right opposite your agenda.

MR. MATHEWS: Yes. And see if there's - the way we've been doing it in the past is you kind of select a window there and we try to usually go to the meeting towards the end of the week, that way if something comes up, we can move within that week time frame. You'll see that the week of February 3rd, your team will be in Tanana, so that week is pretty much out of the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Week which?

MR. MATHEWS: The week of February 3rd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, right.

MR. MATHEWS: So you'd have the week of January 27th, the week of February 10th, February 17th and February 24th. The week of February 10th, there may be a few members who can not be able to make it because that's when the Yukon River Drainage Fisheries Association is meeting in Mountain Village. So I know Angela's on that and I'm trying to think who else is on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have the dates for that?

MR. MATHEWS: Well, I talked to Harry Wilde about that and I believe he said it's February 10th, 11th and 12th, it's a three or four day meeting. Maybe Angela knows more on that.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Ask the co-chair, Gilbert. Gilbert's our co-chair.

MR. MATHEWS: I'm sorry.

MR. G. HUNTINGTON: We haven't worked it out yet.

MR. MATHEWS: You haven't worked it out yet, okay. So forget that, but anyway, sometime during that period of time will be the Drainage Fisheries Association meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would personally favor 13, 14 or 20, 21, either of those. It works better in my schedule to have it end of week. Do any members have any conflicts or dates that we need to be aware of in there?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Angela.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: 20 to 21 would be good, 22, 20, 21, 22.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is what, is the time you prefer?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So how does that look to other members, 20, 21, 22, in that time frame?

MR. REAKOFF: I have problems traveling on a Saturday for me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. DERENDOFF: On the weekends, it's probably the only way we would be able to do that is by charter on the weekends.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. DERENDOFF: There's a limited number of flights coming during the weekends in Huslia.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So you need to move it up to like 19 and 20, so you've got Friday to travel on?

MR. DERENDOFF: Yeah. It would probably be better during the week days.

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can handle that as long as - if I teach, I'm hoping it will be Mondays and Wednesday evenings, I have to be where there's a phone. But I can work around that, I think, like I did this time. How does that look to others? Is that a problem Angela, to move it up?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. All right. What about discussion of location? We've met in Aniak, we've met here, we've met in McGrath, we've met in Huslia, we met in Fairbanks the one time when we had to delay the Holy Cross.....

MR. DEACON: Anchorage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Or Anchorage, I mean, yeah, Anchorage. But that was because the meeting in Holy - the weather didn't allow the one in Holy Cross.

MR. MATHEWS: There's been some discussion about Holy Cross again. There's been discussion of maybe getting up further on the Koyukuk, Allakaket. I don't know where we'll be with fisheries, so that's why I mentioned Holy Cross for the next meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: And we'll just pray for good weather. But I don't know what Angela's feelings are about meeting in Holy Cross.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Try it again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Try again?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Try again.

MR. REAKOFF: Holy Cross will probably be a good place because there's fishery and then there will be that C&T proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Except down there, the guys could travel from snow machine from Anvik and Grayling and Shageluk and we'd have more people attend.

MR. MATHEWS: So it sounds like it's Holy Cross with a backup of Allakaket if.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's really back up.

MR. MATHEWS: And then if we're really weathered out after a couple of tries then we'll go Anchorage or Fairbanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Or McGrath.

MR. MATHEWS: Or McGrath okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it's good to keep it in the area when we can. Okay, do I have a motion to that effect?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: So moved.

MR. DEACON: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So moved by Angela and seconded by Henry. Any further discussion?

MR. DEACON: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favor signify by raising your right hand. Okay, yes votes for all five members present, motion carried. All right, and like others, you have to understand if we get into weather or other things, we may be calling you - Vince and I will talk and then we'll get back to you if we have to make any changes, but I hope that won't happen.

Okay, that takes care of that. Any other meetings, I guess there will be an audio conference I'll be involved in the end of this month and then there's a meeting with the Board. And again, if something should happen, we may be calling on the vice chair to take part in that or one of you others as appropriate. And that's all, I guess until the February meeting then.

Any issues, topics and so on you want to identify for the agenda then? Things that should be discussed? If we're in Holy Cross it would probably be a good time to talk about a longer range fix on the Innoko area there like we were talking here on the - you know, how that problem might be addressed? Whether we should be working more closely with Western or just what we might do on that whole.....

MR. MATHEWS: Well, on that one you would need to interact with Y-K and then McGash (ph) advisory committee and I don't know when they meet. I'll try to find out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But we could try to have some representatives there maybe if that was a topic. But I think we got to try to start looking ahead and try to think long - because it's the same thing as the Koyukuk, it's a growing issue with expanding numbers of hunters every year and at some point they're going to have to put a ceiling on it. So what is a reasonable approach to doing that? How do we approach it? So that was one topic that I think of and maybe by then there will be fishery topics. Hopefully they'll go slow on that.

Any other issues that you can think of? Do the agencies have anything to propose that we should be thinking about? Okay. Well, let Vince know if there's things that come to mind that should be on that agenda.

MR. MATHEWS: And on that note, keep calling the 800 number, the one in Anchorage, they'll transfer it. Soon I'll be getting a - I'm crossing my

fingers I'll be getting an 800 number in Fairbanks, but call that one and they'll transfer. I would give you my desk phone number, but it keeps changing. So instead of giving you the one that doesn't work, just call the 800 number and you'll find me.

MR. DERENDOFF: In Anchorage?

MR. MATHEWS: No, I'm in Fairbanks now.

MR. MERRIT: I propose a 10 minute break.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was just going to do that, Ed. And then when we come back, somebody be prepared for a presentation.

(Off Record)

(On Record)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's come back into session please. The next item we had on the agenda was the presentation of - I see Tom here now. So Tom, do you want to begin?

MR. EARLY: Yes. I'm Tom Early, manager of Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. And I appreciate just spending a little bit of time with the Council and you, Mr. Chair. We'd like to discuss, basically the guiding principles and purposes of national wildlife refuges and tie that in a little bit with predator/prey relationships and some of the criteria that's necessary for us to go through in order to allow controlled activities, I guess, for any animal species on refuge or any animal manipulation. And I have some slides and I'll be reading from the script here, I hope that's okay.

Moose are one of the most important animals in the subsistence lifestyle in many parts of Alaska. And hunting moose occurs on most of the national wildlife refuges in Alaska. Some people who depend on moose for food are concerned that too many moose are being killed by wolves, wolf control is being discussed as a possible action to improve hunting success in their area. There are many agencies in Alaska that manage fish and wildlife on public lands, including the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Forest Service and the Department of Fish & Game. Each of these agencies has a different mission and often different approaches to accomplishing the mission of their agencies.

And what I'm going to be talking about is basically the mission and purposes of the national wildlife refuges in Alaska in a broad scope. We hope this slide show will help you to understand the significance of the national wildlife refuges in Alaska to Alaskans and to all Americans. In addition, we would like to familiarize you with the purposes of each of the refuge managers and how we make management decisions, such as whether to do wolf control on refuge lands. Our approach is to resource management and the people management.

The national wildlife refuge system consists of over 500 national wildlife refuges across the United States. They are cared for by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and preserve a national network of lands and waters for conservation and management of fish and wildlife and plant resources for the benefit of present and future generations.

The first national wildlife refuges in Alaska were established in the early 1900s to protect nesting sea birds. Most of those areas now are within the Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge. And in 1980, ANILCA, Alaska National

Interest Lands Conservation Act, it added land to seven existing national wildlife refuges and created nine new refuges in Alaska. Just as important, ANILCA, also established new purposes, rules and guidance for Alaskan refuges to assure that traditional and customary access and uses would be maintained for your subsistence way of life and that these ways of life could be preserved for future generations. I'd like to add that this is a lot different than the Lower 48 refuges where they are pretty much closed to public access. The Alaskan refuges are, for the most part, open to public access and public use. The 16 refuges in Alaska vary from just under a million acres to almost 20 million acres in size. And from a systemwide prospective, Alaskan refuges are unique in both their size and the fact that they are typically contain entire and healthy ecosystems.

In comparison, refuges in the Lower 48 are, for the most part, pockets of critical habitat that must be managed intensively to makeup for habitat that has been lost to development. As I mentioned before, the Alaskan refuges provide undisturbed fish and wildlife habitat and animals here, for the most part, have healthy homes. ANILCA details at least four purposes for each refuge. Some refuges have several other additional purposes, but all of the refuges, for the most part, all of them have these purposes and it's the cornerstone of our management program.

The first and the principal refuge purpose is to conserve fish and wildlife populations and habitats in their natural diversity. Refuge employees are continually learning about fish and wildlife populations from local residents. The Regional Subsistence Councils provide an excellent way to do this and for local residents to have a meaningful role in refuge management and decision making and they provide a real meaningful role for decision making.

In addition to animal populations, refuge employees are learning about habitat, what animals need to live because the quality of habitat directly effects animal populations. Once again, the local knowledge that you and the village elders have would give us a much needed historical perspective and greatly help us to understand what the data from our studies really means.

The second refuge objective is to fulfill the International Treaty obligations of the United States with respect to Fish & Wildlife and their habitats. International treaties concerning migratory birds are held with Canada, Mexico, Russia and Japan. There are also international treaties concerning endangered species, polar bears and salmon.

The third purpose is to provide opportunity for continued subsistence uses by local residents. Again, basically all of the Alaskan refuges has that as their guiding purpose. Again, refuge employees can learn from local residents what subsistence uses are important in the local area when, where and how they have taken place and what may be needed to maintain your traditional and customary uses of each refuge.

The fourth and final purpose is to ensure water quality and water quantity within the refuge. Fish and wildlife hydrologists are documenting stream flow and lake levels on many of the refuges, but much more work needs to be done. We need to mention here that the third and fourth refuge purposes must be consistent with the first and primary purpose of conserving fish and wildlife populations and habitats in their natural diversity.

These four purposes guide refuge managers in determining what uses and how much of each use should occur on a refuge. Now, Title VIII of ANILCA further details

the importance and obligations of Federal agencies for continuing subsistence uses on all Federal lands in Alaska. ANILCA clearly states that the opportunity for rural Alaska residents to practice their subsistence way of life will have priority over hunting and fishing by other users. And, for example, should it become necessary to reduce harvest levels to maintain healthy populations of an animal, refuge managers would limit sport hunting opportunity prior to limiting subsistence hunting opportunities and fishing opportunities. ANILCA allows for reasonable access to refuge lands for subsistence uses. The use of traditional transportation such as airplanes, motor boats and snow machines to conduct subsistence activities is permitted. Refuges are used by many people. Americans and people from all over the world visit refuges. Recreational hunters and fishermen, campers, guides, and others spend time on refuges. Some take fish and game, others do not. Some uses impact habitat and other uses do not.

One of the refuge managers most important jobs is to ensure that what happens on a refuge conserves fish and wildlife resources and that the impacts of human use are not harmful or contrary to the purposes for which the refuge was established. The process which guides the manager in these decisions is called a compatibility determination. A compatibility determination takes a close look at the purposes of a refuge. A decision is made about whether the purpose is compatible with these resources. And every time a new use is proposed, the refuge manager must decide if uses can be allowed on the refuge. Refuge managers also periodically review all uses to ensure that the current impacts are compatible with refuge purposes. These decisions are documented in writing. Some of the compatibility determinations that we have to face annually would be whether or not to allow guides on refuges. Recreational uses, certain types of recreational uses that are permitted, et cetera. And these, we go through a determination whether or not it's compatible with the purposes of the refuge. That it includes an 810 determination, Title VIII of ANILCA determination also on these activities.

There has been a growing interest expressed by local residents about wolf control on several national wildlife life refuges in Alaska and primarily in the Interior. The Service was involved in wolf control in Alaska in 1950s. And I am sure many of the elders remember this and the resulting increase in the moose populations. Since that time the legal and social climate regarding wolf control has changed. To consider wolf control on national wildlife refuges today, managers would need to consider a number of issues. We would need to know if moose populations are at unhealthy levels. If they are, is wolf predation causing low numbers or are there other ecological or human factors that need to be considered. We would need to determine whether wolf control would be effective and assure that healthy populations of moose and other animals could be maintained. We would need to consider other management alternatives to wolf control such as liberalizing wolf trapping season or other alternatives that may be possible. We would do a compatibility determination to make sure that a wolf control program would be consistent with refuge purposes. We would need to make sure that wolf control would be consistent with the goals and objectives of State and refuge management plans. We would have to satisfy the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, for short, satisfy these requirements which would probably require an environmental impact statement and extensive public comment. There is also a probability that both administrative and legal challenges would occur which might tie up the process for many years. We also need to evaluate how a wolf control program that might effect subsistence uses and needs as Section 804 of Title VIII of ANILCA requires us to make this determination - this evaluation.

These are the main issues the Service must consider prior to starting a wolf control program on a refuge. The situation is much different now than it was in the 1950s when wolf control was practiced on refuges in Alaska. We must manage Alaska's national wildlife refuges as ANILCA intended and we must also comply with the National Environmental Policy Acts as well as other acts. A decision to begin a wolf control program on national wildlife refuges cannot be easily or quickly made. Our job is to manage Alaska national wildlife refuges for all American people and their children for you and your children.

So that's the end of my show. I'll take any questions and hopefully someone else might be here to help me out, too, if I need it. To kind of give you an overview of the purposes of national wildlife refuges and help you understand, I guess, the decisions, how we make decisions and some of the implications involved with, specifically in this case, wolf control on refuges, it's not as easy as it used to be, legally.

MR. S. HUNTINGTON: It's not as easy as it used to be and I don't see why you would want to implement a wolf control because.....

MR. OSBORNE: Sidney you need to go to the microphone.

MR. S. HUNTINGTON: You were saying that implementing a wolf control program is not as easy as it used to be. But it's just as easy as it used to be, but you're tied down by - you're all tied up where you can't implement a wolf control. The Federal government is sitting down here discussing subsistence uses of various resources of the State of Alaska for a very specific bunch of people in the State of Alaska which at one time was named Indian, now they named the bastards rural, ruralites. And so we're supposed to be taking care of those wildlife resources that you stated in your statements for these particular people, that's why they made the withdrawals and stuff like that, refuges and Federal lands all over so you be sure to feed these people. Now, you're saying that you can't use one of your tools to preserve the wildlife resources to feed these people, you want to implement a wolf control program. By the time you get the wolf control program implemented, you know, wildlife resources, ungulates or whatever are dead, then the wolf is gone so you need neither and so you don't need no subsistence category because you killed it off.

MR. EARLY: It's not impossible to implement the wolf control, but it's a lengthy process. And I think you're right, we would need to think about this years in advance, at least, several years in advance in order to get the process started. It's technically paperwork wise and legally not as easy as it used to be in that contest.

MR. S. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, but if we're going to make paperwork out of paper and emotions and stuff like that, you can't manage resources with people's emotions and stuff like that. You fellows are supposed to be the engineers. You got some of the finest engineers, biologists, both in the State and the Federal government that could go out there and take care of these wildlife resources. Nobody's asking nobody to eliminate any part of the wildlife resource, that's part of the ecosystem. We, the human predators, we control them. We tell them you can only take one wolf or you can't - or one moose or other game to eat because they're little now, you can't have too many. You control them, that's the human predator.

You can write all the God damn stories you want or think all you want and try to get into that wolf's head that he can't kill over one moose a year, when he eats six. The only the way you can stop them from taking six is you have to kill a

few of them, balance the thing. You have the ingenuity and ability to be able to balance this ecosystem.

Years ago before the white man invaded Plymouth Rock and what not, it didn't balance. The Natives did not have the expertise to go out and balance it. Part of that predator ecosystem that they belonged to, there used to be starvation after starvation. My parents moved from the Koyukuk River two times (indiscernible) lifetime to keep from starving on the Koyukuk River before there was no game on the Koyukuk. Why? Because there was nobody to balance this thing. Today, we find out we can balance it. 1928 when I was on the Koyukuk River, there was not one God damn moose up there and no wolves either and they finally came back. But they say they heard of stories where there used to be moose long ago. You could get some pretty drastic stuff. I was over there on the Kobuk a few years ago and hunted caribou and I got eight caribou. And I was sitting down skinning these things. This is a story worth listening to. I was sitting down skinning them and the late Jim (indiscernible) come to me with another old (indiscernible), they heard that I had a heart attack before and I had a bypass and they were coming out and checking on me. And they say, Sidney, you do a good job taking care of that meat. They said, we're really proud how you take care of it, but you make one mistake. And then I told them, what? You know, every place - I've never hunted caribou before, I come over here because I wanted to get one in my life. Every place you go, I told them on the Koyukuk River where I was raised, I there's lots of superstitions on how you take care of a beaver and how you skin a wolf, how you take care of animals and stuff like that. We all have it. Oh, no, no, this is not superstitious, this is the story and I'll tell you the story, he said. Years ago, what he wanted me to do by the way was save the (indiscernible) hoof of the caribou, cut them off and he told me how to do it. You have the (indiscernible) and hoof. And I had eight caribou, he had them on a string. If you take those when you get home and put them in a can, that's what you do. So I brought them home, I don't know if I have them yet or not, but anyway, he said that years ago that they know that this happened, historic with them, they take the hoof and put them in the can, they stay there for years sometimes. One point in time, he said, the wolves got so thick and caribou was really thick and then the wolves multiplying, multiplying, multiplying. Pretty soon they saw wolf carcasses, caribou carcasses all over the place. Wolf kill them and just leave them, just like some of those pictures I seen last night of moose laying around. That's what the wolves were doing with the caribou. Pretty soon the caribou started going down and they started going down, they go down really fast. No more caribou. Then the wolves tried killing each other. When they got no more to kill, then they look for the human segment. But they know and they go underground. They take what they can with them and they go underground and stay underground. And they take these (indiscernible) and hoofs. You can live for a long time, just boil them and you get the broth out of them hoofs, they might be 10 years old, you get that broth and it's enough to survive on. One thing the wolf could not take was the fish under the ice. Went into the woods and killed each other off and come back out, there's no more wolves, there's no more caribou, the wolves will go fishing again (indiscernible).

These are the things, people say, Indians are afraid of wolves, well you're God damn right they're afraid of wolves. Because these things have happened in the past historically and then brought down by their ancestors to the younger kids to respect that animal. They respect the brown bear the same way. They had no way to conquer wolves. You can't hold a wolf very long with a rawhide (indiscernible) and stuff like that, you know that. And so they had no methods or means, other than the bow and arrow maybe to conquer them, you know. It

wasn't like a brown bear with a spear, you know, that's a different story, you know, altogether. That's easier to conquer than the wolf was.

And so when you say you can't or you're going to - we're going to make it sound pretty good, you say, oh, yeah, we'll do Federal wolf control on Federal land, what you just stated in your talk, all hell and high water is not going to - I was going to ask you, when the hell is the last wolf control there you went back into the 50s and stuff like that when they poisoned all the wolves and stuff like that. But, you know, there is a way, a human way to handle these things. And it's not trapping or nothing - aerial shooting (indiscernible) of the wolves. You don't drag them out of the country when you shoot wolves, you don't drag them out. Because they don't know what in the hell happened to mom and papa, they never seen them die. You get them in a trap and a snare, they see them die and then you - disperse them, they go into another person's country. And like the Indians do, go around - somebody else's hunting grounds area, they - you'll be shot. My Uncle Frank was shot by the Selawickers when he crossed the divide up there in Hoge River. They shoot him because he was going into somebody's hunting grounds. The wolf is no God damn different, you know, no different. And so they disperse and they eliminate each other after awhile. You do aerial hunting, we don't do that. It's humane. They say you chase them until they drop, the only way you could do that is with a helicopter, you know. A man would be crazy to chase a wolf for one hour, that's when they drop they say. And so I think that we're going the wrong - we're not taking care of the subsistence uses that this Board and your Federal government is supposed to be mandated to do. They will promise to the Indian that you take care of that wildlife resources until they die. There's no God damn difference when Udall was right here standing in this God damn building right here. He stood up and told everybody, as long as you were born before 1971, you can use the wildlife resources in the State of Alaska until you die. And I got up and I said, that's fine, sir, but I told him I have grandchildren, I have children and they're going to have children and they're going to have children, what in the hell are they going to eat and stuff. They're going to all be born after '71, you know what I got from him, he said you're a wiseguy and a trouble maker, that's what I got.

And so we're not designated what we're supposed to be doing. And this Board in all earnest and in good faith, we're here to designate subsistence use and you sitting here, not because it's your fault, you designate it that we can't do nothing for you. We'll let the God damn wolves eat up this stuff and there's nothing we can do about it because of some emotions of some millionaire that some people have in the Lower 48. That's wrong, that's evil. That's the devil in the people in the Lower 48 to make regulations for these people that existed off this wildlife resource for thousands of God damn years. And like I said, good wise use of our management of a little control and take care of the ecosystem, the habitat and whatnot, we could have it for a long, long time to come. When your God damn oil and your gold and timber and some of this other bullshit is gone, we'll have nothing but the God damn tourism and we can't eat them sons-of-bitches. So that's what we're going to have, nothing out here in the bush. A few people like Walter Hickel and Tony Knowles and them guys, great big Rasmussen, hotel, sure they'll get rich, but what the hell we're going to get out here, nothing. And so, you know, when you say you're going to control wolves, don't say you can control wolves, because God damn, you know you can't. They're not going to let you do that, you know that, you're under the Federal government. If you fellows control wolves, you'd lose your job if you push it too God damn hard. The next fellow on down the line will do his job until Congress gets the last man out here that implemented the wolf control program. And the environmentalist in the Lower 48 will get him, that congressman from

ever being able to let that pass. You know God damn well we're not living in that kind of a world anymore, there's no God damn common sense and people got no chance at all. Any time you start giving stuff to people for nothing, give them a way of life for nothing, give them an education for nothing, how in the hell do you expect people to act otherwise than that.

Wolf, right now is one of the biggest God damn moneymakers for the - the defenders of animals and stuff like that. That's why they're contradicting us, our way of life. They're contradicting - they give a God damn less of what you fellows are aiming at to protect the wildlife resource for the subsistence use. They care less about that. And as long as they can make some money off the God damn wolves and he's their scrap (indiscernible), not ours.

I hope I answered your question.

(Laughter)

MR. EARLY: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other questions for Tom in relation to the presentation? I think you got caught on that one Tom.

MR. EARLY: I was expecting it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Vince, you have some information for us? We have some guests that have arrived?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes. Mr. Chairman, I don't know how to proceed on this, but the group, I'll probably get their title wrong, the National Academy of Science group that's looking at the management of wolf and grizzly bear populations in Alaska have arrived. I don't know how we want to proceed with this or how we want to handle this. And I'm not sure, the names that were given to me, I'm not sure they're here, all of them, so I'll turn it over to one of them to introduce themselves and leave it up to your guidance as to how to proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. ORIONS: Thank you. I'm Gordon Orions, Professor of Merits of Zoology at the University of Washington at Seattle and I'm chair of the committee. Several members of which are here. The committee is split into four groups today. One group is at McGrath, another at Aniak, one here and another group visiting with people in Anchorage gathering data.

As you know, this committee was formed as a result of a request by Tony Knowles to examine the scientific and economic underpinnings of any predator control program to determine the adequacy of the scientific data, it's utility for predicting the power of the economic tools for doing analysis of the economic values of consumptive and non-consumptive uses of natural resources. And we're here on a fact gathering mission. We've been meeting with people in Anchorage. We're going to have meetings in Fairbanks. We had a public hearing in Anchorage last night. There will be a public hearing in Fairbanks Saturday morning. But we're delighted to have a chance to visit you.

We're here, not to tell you things, we're here to listen to what it is you have to tell us about the problems and concerns with a wolf and bear management and control as you perceive them. Let me hasten to add that the National Research Council, which is the working arm of the Academy and it's reports, we do not

tell people what to do. In our task, we've been asked simply to assess the adequacy of information and we'll carry out that task. We will not make policy recommendations, nor will we deal with ethical issues which are not a part of our charge.

The other members of the committee that are here are Rocky Gutierrez is a professor at Humboldt State in Arcata, California and Michael Hanemann, who's an economist at the University of California Berkeley. And then Jeff Peck, who is the National Research Council staff officer who handles all the logistics and gets us here and there. And so we're just delighted to be able to be able to meet with you, we're at your service. We want to fit in with whatever your schedule is and we're here to listen and we will ask questions as you present us with information and concerns. And any written materials that you have that can come as a part of our analysis will be most welcome. We will be having additional meetings and hope to be able to deliver a final report to the Governor in August.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you. In terms of how to proceed here, we've more or less, we've concluded our business here. And since your group is not a direct connection with the Federal, it might be better, I would suggest, we might just adjourn our meeting and then we can discuss this and provide you with information and it doesn't need to be part of our record of our meeting here. I'm wondering if that might be best. Because we don't have a direct connection, we're just providing you with information and we'd be happy to share with you.

MR. ORIENS: The National Academy of Science is not part of the Federal government, it's private.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. ORIENS: So however you feel it's useful to proceed, that's fine with us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How does that sound to members, do you want to do that and then we're free to just discuss this as long as you want here? Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, on that note, I do have their statement of task and the names of all the people of the panel that are available in your books and then I'll have it for the public.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: These are those orange colored or whatever color those are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. Do I have a motion then to adjourn?

MR. DEACON: Move to adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Henry moves, is there a second?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Angela. Any discussion? All in favor signify by raising your right hand. Okay, yes votes for five members present, motion carried. So we are officially adjourned in terms of our regular business.

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

* * * * *

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
) ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter for R&R Court Reporters, Inc., do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 120 through 161 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the Western Interior Regional Subsistence Advisory Council meeting taken electronically by me on the 24th day of October 1996, beginning at the hour of 8:30 o'clock a.m. at Old Community Hall, Galena, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by me to the best of my knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 4th day of November 1996.

Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 11/5/98